

## Notes on the Aulodic *nomoi* *Apothetos* and *Schoinion*

Marco Ercoles

Alma Mater Studiorum—Università di Bologna

Dip. di Filologia Classica e Italianistica

Via Zamboni 32, I—40126 Bologna

marco.ercoles@unibo.it

### Abstract

Notes upon aulodic *nomoi*, particularly the *Apothetos* and the *Schoinion*: the first one was probably so named after the claim of its supposed inventor, Clonas, to have made the larger public know a not (or not yet) widely-circulated melody, perhaps on the occasion of a great festival; the second one was perhaps so called because it resembled in some way the Grey Wagtail's call (in Greek *Schoiniōn* or *Schoiniklos*), recognized by Greeks as a melody characterized by a well defined rhythm.

### Keywords

aulody – aulodic *nomoi* – Clonas – *Apothetos* – *Schoinion* – Ps.-Plutarch *De musica*

One of the main sources of Ps.-Plutarch's *De musica*,<sup>1</sup> Heraclides of Pontus (4th-3rd century BC), gives an important piece of evidence about aulodic music in the 7th century BC (fr. 157 Wehrli = *Mus.* 1132d), viz. the 'canonization' of some melodic schemes (*nomoi*)<sup>2</sup> at the time of—and probably under the influence of—Clonas from Tegea or Thebes, famous as a composer of

---

1 Hereafter simply '*Mus.*'

2 On musical *nomoi* see Barker 1984, 249–55; West 1992, 214–16.

processional songs, elegiacs and epic verses, and Polymnestus from Colophon, who cultivated the same poetic forms as his predecessor:<sup>3</sup>

οἱ δὲ νόμοι οἱ κατὰ τούτους (i.e. Clonas and Polymnestus), ἀγαθὲ Ὀνησίκρατες, αὐλωδικοὶ ἦσαν· Ἀπόθετος, Ἑλεγοί, Κωμάρχιος, Σχοινίων, †Κηπίων τε καὶ Δεῖος† καὶ Τριμελής· ὕστερῳ δὲ χρόνῳ καὶ τὰ Πολυμνήστεια καλούμενα ἐξευρέθη. οἱ δὲ τῆς κιθαρωδίας νόμοι πρότερον <οὐ> πολλῷ χρόνῳ τῶν αὐλωδικῶν κατεστάθησαν ἐπὶ Τερπάνδρου.

Apart from the sequence Κηπίων τε καὶ Δεῖος, very likely corrupted,<sup>4</sup> the names Ἑλεγοί, Κωμάρχιος and Τριμελής are themselves quite clear and have been explained quite unanimously by modern scholars:<sup>5</sup> the first one seems to refer to a mournful song, such as those composed by the aulode Echembrotus from Tasus, who describes his own works as μέλεα καὶ ἐλέγους (fr. 1 Campbell); the second one can be connected with the Dionysiac revel (see Eur. *Ph.* 791, where the army is defined as a κῶμος ἀναυλότατος in opposition to Dionysiac κῶμος) or, more generally, with a processional kind of performance (it is worth remembering that *prosodia*, processional songs, were mainly performed to the *aulos* and were among Clonas' and Polymnestos' works);<sup>6</sup> the third one, finally, refers to a threefold song: a Sicyonian chronicle (*FGrHist* 550 F 2 = *Mus.* 1134b)<sup>7</sup> makes it clear that each part, corresponding to a single stanza, was composed in a different key or *tonos* (respectively, Dorian, Phrygian and Lydian). Less self-evident are the names of the *nomoi* Ἀπόθετος and Σχοινίων, both strictly

3 On both the poets cf. *Mus.* 1132c; for other testimonia see Gentili-Prato 2002, 10-13 (Clonas and Polymnestus) and Campbell 1988, 330-35 (Polymnestus).

4 For a discussion of the passage, with an overview of modern scholars' emendations, see Paterlini 2001, who however considers the transmitted text sound. Nevertheless, the presence of Kepion, the name of Terpander's favourite disciple and of a kitharodic *nomos*, is very suspect, as is the connective nexus τε καὶ, perfectly in place in the list of kitharodic *nomoi* (*Mus.* 1132d), not in that of aulodic *nomoi*. All this seems to favour Lasserre's (1954, 106) idea of the slipping of the copyist's eye from one place to another (in both cases at the end of a writing line) because of the identity of the first letters (κη) of two *nomoi*. Not altogether convincing is his emendation κῆδεῖος: between κη and δεῖος some letters should be missing, otherwise it is difficult to see how the copyist's eye could slip from κη] to κηπίωνά τε καὶ]. One can suppose that κη- was the beginning of a name and -δεῖος the ending of another: κη<±10 letters>|δεῖος.

5 See e.g. Flach 1883, 258-260; Del Grande 1932, 26 and 1960, 425; Lasserre 1954, 23; Barker 1984, 252f.

6 On the performance of *prosodia* see Grandolini 1993 and Pinervi 2010-2011.

7 The epigraphic chronicle probably dates back to the 5th century BC: cf. Lanata 1963, 282f.

associated with Clonas in antiquity (see *Mus.* 1133a-b and Poll. 4.79, probably depending on the same source).<sup>8</sup> Many hypotheses have been formulated by scholars in order to explain these denominations: in what follows, they will be discussed and some new arguments will be adduced to support some of them.

The name Ἀπόθετος was interpreted by Burette (1735, 122)<sup>9</sup> as a reference to a song “reserved” for solemn occasions, while Del Grande (1960, 425) thought of a melodic scheme for a “reserved” occasion, i.e. a ritual restricted to few people. Flach (1883, 257f.), in his turn, saw a connexion with Spartan Ἀπόθεται, the ceremony during which malformed infants were exposed (Plut. *Lyc.* 16.13).<sup>10</sup> An interesting proposal, but unfortunately far from granted. A different approach is that suggested by Barker (1984, 252): “one can imagine the term being taken from a poet’s boast ‘I shall reveal a new song, hidden until now’, or the like”. This is, in my opinion, the likeliest interpretation. For a similar assertion one can compare Timotheus’ words in *Persae*’s *sphragis* (fr. 791.229-33 Hord.): νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος μέτροις / ῥυθμοῖς τ’ ἐνδεκακρουμάτοις / κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει, / θησαυρὸν πολύυμνον οἶ-/ξας Μουσᾶν θαλαμειτόν.<sup>11</sup> *Persae* was a citharodic, not an aulodic piece, but, of course, such claims of artistry (and authorship) were not confined to citharodic poetry: any composer could assert his own artistry (cf. e.g. Alc. *PMGF* 39, Theogn. 19-23, Pind. *O.* 3.4-6). Clonas, therefore, could claim that he invented a new *nomos* or, simply, that he brought out a “stowed-away” *nomos* to the larger public. The latter possibility seems preferable on the basis of the use of the adjective ἀπόθετος with reference to texts: as Labarbe (1949, 379) showed, “ἀπόθετος, appliqué à un texte [...], désigne, de façon très générale, ce qui est ‘mis ou laissé de côté’, c’est-à-dire ce que le grand public ignore (quelle que soit la raison de son ignorance)”. An instructive case is that of Homeric ἀπόθετα ἔπη, verses ‘published’ by the Homeridae as little known works of Homer.<sup>12</sup> Plato (*Phaedr.* 252b) quotes two of these lines and says they were recited only by some of the Homeridae (τινες Ὀμηριδῶν): the indefinite pronoun suggests that

8 *Mus.* 1133a-b περί δὲ Κλονᾶ ὅτι τὸν Ἀπόθετον νόμον καὶ Σχοινίωνα πεποιοηκώς εἶη μνημονεύουσιν οἱ ἀναγεγραφότες (perhaps the authors of the Sicyonian chronicle cited above: cf. Westphal 1865, 72f.) and Poll. 4.79 καὶ Κλονᾶ δὲ νόμοι αὐλητικοὶ ἀπόθετός τε καὶ σχοινίων. In the Sicyonian chronicle (*FGrHist* 550 F 2) the Τριμελής was credited to Clonas too, but there was not an ancient *communis opinio*: according to *Mus.* 1134b it was Sacadas of Argos who invented this *nomos*.

9 See also Volkmann 1856, 76, in agreement with Burette.

10 For this interpretation see also Tunison 1896, 17; Lasserre 1954, 23; Nobili 2011, 31.

11 ‘Now Timotheus renews the cithara with eleven-stringed metres and rhythms, opening the many-songed chambered treasury of the Muses’ (transl. Hordern).

12 See Labarbe 1949, 378-83 (with an examination of all the occurrences); Andersen 2011, 366.

“certains rhapsodes se signalaient à l’attention des auditeurs en produisant des ‘inédits’—réels ou apocryphes, peu importe—qui manquaient au répertoire de leurs confrères” (Labarbe 1949, 381). Similarly, Clonas could boast that he brought a not (or not yet) widely circulated *nomos* to a larger public; e.g., it is possible to think of a regional melodic scheme, Arcadian or Boeotian, that was brought over the frontier of its original region, perhaps on the occasion of a great festival.<sup>13</sup>

As far as the *Σχοινίων* is concerned, five proposals have been advanced: (1) the majority of the scholars saw a connexion with *σχοινίον*, ‘small rope made of bulrush’, and interpreted it as a reference to the laxity and ‘effeminacy’ of the *nomos* (so Casaubon 1621, 894, on the basis of Hesych. σ 3038 Hansen *σχοινίνην φωνήν· τήν σαθράν καὶ διερωγυῖαν*)<sup>14</sup> or, alternatively, to its Dionysiac character (so Thiersch 1820, 253 n. 7, on the basis of the Pindaric description of the ancient dithyramb as a “song coming forth stretched like a rope” in fr. 70b Maehler);<sup>15</sup> (2) Volkmann (1856, 76) suggested a geographical explanation, with reference to the Boeotian city of *Σχοῖνος*; (3) Flach (1883, 258) thought that “wird man nur an das persische Maass Schoenos denken können, von welchem jener Nomos wegen seiner eigenthümlichen und abgeschmackten Länge seinen Namen erhalten haben wird”; (4) Tunison (1896, 17) considered the name *σχοινίων* to be taken from that of homonymous bird, “which lived among the rushes, *σχοῖνοι*, at the brink of ponds and water-courses” (more precisely, a tail-wagging Grey Wagtail or *Motacilla cinerea*: see Arnott 2007, 306 s.v.);<sup>16</sup> (5) Lasserre (1954, 23),

13 One can observe that a more appropriate name for a regional *nomos* would have been a denomination deriving from the originary region of the melody (cf. e.g. the *Boiotios* or the *Aiolios nomos*). This is true, but unfortunately we can not know the (possible) original name of the *nomos*, preceding Clonas’ reworking of it (for a similar case of a double denomination, let us remember of the *Terpandreios nomos* quoted by Poll. 4.65, which is perhaps another name for the *Orthios nomos*, or better for Terpander’s reworking of that melody: cf. Wilamowitz 1903, 90 n. 1; Gostoli 1990, XVII–XIX). If such a ‘regional’ name had existed, we should suppose that it was lost because the other one (*Apothetos*) was more successful. For the relevance of regional music traditions in Archaic age see Comotti 1991, 18; West 1992, 334.

14 Cf. also Burette 1735, 122 and Weil-Reinach 1900, 17. *Contra* Volkmann 1856, 76.

15 The proposal has been accepted by many scholars: see, among others, Del Grande 1932, 26 and 1960, 425; West 1992, 344 n. 67; Porter 2007, 18–21; Nobili 2011, 31f. The meaning of the Pindaric expression is not clear; it seems to imply a monotonous performance (cf. van der Weiden 1991, 63f.), perhaps characterized by long rhythmical and musical periods (cf. Lavecchia 2000, 125–30).

16 For this interpretation see also Barker 1984, 252 and Ballerio 2000, 24. On the *σχοινίων* or *σχοινίζλος* (in Latin *motacilla*) see Arist. *HA* 8.593b1–6 and 610a8f.

finally, took the name as a genitive from σχοινίον, comparing the name with that of the auletic νόμος Κραδίας (the melody accompanying the whipping of scapegoats with fig-branches),<sup>17</sup> and suggested that σχοινίων could be an allusion to the Spartan ritual of flogging ephebes at Orthia's altar, or alternatively to the ritual harvesting of bulrushes along the banks of Eurotas river in order to make couches for boys aged seven.<sup>18</sup>

In support of the first hypothesis one might bring also Cratin. fr. dub. 361a-c K.-A. εὖτε κισσοχαῖτ' ἀναξχαῖρ', ἔφασκ' Ἐκφαντίδης. / πάντα φορητά, πάντα τολμητὰ τῷδε τῷ χορῷ. / πλὴν Ξενίου νόμοισι καὶ Σχοινίωνος, ᾧ Χάρων,<sup>19</sup> verses perhaps deriving from the same (parabatic?) context, but probably not contiguous.<sup>20</sup> As Kassel and Austin observed (*PCG* 4.299 *ad loc.*), in the third line the poet is perhaps playing with the ambiguousness between the name of the aulodic *nomos* and the surname of Callias, the comic poet, whose father was a maker of rush-ropes (cf. *Suda* κ 213 Adler ἐπεκλήθη Σχοινίων διὰ τὸ σχοινοπλόκου εἶναι πατρός). This would suggest that in Classical Athens the ancient *nomos* was associated with rush-ropes. Unfortunately, the lack of a larger context makes it impossible to understand if the joke concerned only the phonetic aspect or involved the meaning too: in this second case, the fragment would favour the interpretation Σχοινίων = 'Little rope'.

More promising are the elements which can be adduced to support the fourth hypothesis. The possibility that an aulodic aria could be named after a bird perfectly matches the musical metaphors used by a younger contemporary of Clonas, Alcman, to qualify his own activity as a composer: in one fragment (*PMGF* 39) the poet boasts that he invented the words and the melody of his song by harking to the tongued cry of partridges (φέπη τάδε καὶ μέλος Ἀλκμάν / εὖρε γεγλωσσαμέναν / κακκαβίδων ὅπα συνθέμενος), while in another (*PMGF* 40) he claims to know the tunes of all birds (φοῖδα δ' ὀρνίχων νόμῳ / παντῶν).<sup>21</sup> This is the first appearance of the metaphor 'bird call = melodic custom (νόμος)'. Clonas too could use the name of a bird to refer to his song—obviously, it is impossible to say if it was he who gave the name to the aulodic *nomos* or, as is perhaps more likely, he just compared the melody of his own song to that of the bird and later this comparison inspired the name of the melodic scheme.

17 Cf. *Mus.* 1133f, Hesych. κ 3918 Latte, Phot. κ 1045 Theodoridis.

18 Cf. Plut. *Lyc.* 16.1.

19 'Hail ivy-haired Lord Euios, as Ecphantides said, / everything's got to be borne and dared by this chorus / except from the 'nomes' of Xenias and Schoinion, O Charon' (transl. E. Bakola).

20 Cf. Bakola 2010, 40.

21 On both the fragments see Gentili 1971.

Moreover, the *σχινίων* or *σχινίικλος* is associated by Aristotle (*HA* 8.593b) with another passerine, the *κίγκλος* or White Wagtail, because of the up-and-down movement of tail. This motion should be perceived as a well defined rhythmical cadence if the comic poet Autocrates (fr. 1 K.-A.) resorted to it to describe the dance of Lydian maidens honouring the Ephesian Artemis: the girls resemble the White Wagtail in sinking on their haunches and springing up again (vv. 6-9 καὶ τοῖν ἰσχίοιν / τὸ μὲν κάτω τὸ δ' αὖ / εἰς ἄνω ἐξαίρουσα, / οἷα κίγκλος ἄλλεται). This dance performance, known as *δκλασμα* or *Περσικόν*, was accompanied by the *aulos*.<sup>22</sup> If the White Wagtail was recognized as a 'musical' animal, this could true for the Grey Wagtail too. In these terms, the *nomos Σχινίων* could be a melodic scheme, characterized, among other things, by a well recognizable rhythm, imitative of that of the homonymous bird in the same way as the melody of Alcman *PMGF* 40 imitated the partridge's song.

If the present discussion is acceptable, it is not difficult to understand why the *nomoi* Ἀπόθετος and Σχινίων were strictly associated with Clonas in ancient sources: both took probably their names from the very words of the composer, who boasted of the novelty of his own music, in the first case, and compared his melody to that of a bird (or said he took the melody from the bird's voice), in the second.

### Bibliographic References

- Andersen, Ø. 2011. *Homeridae*, in: Finkelberg, M. (ed.) *The Homer Encyclopedia* (Chichester), 365-66.
- Arnott, W.G. 2007. *Birds in the ancient world from A to Z* (London/New York).
- Bakola, E. 2010. *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy* (Oxford-New York).
- Ballerio, R. 2000. *Plutarco. La musica* (Milano).
- Barker, A. 1984. *Greek musical writings*, I (Cambridge).
- Burette, M. 1735. *Dialogue de Plutarque sur la musique* (Paris).
- Campbell, D.A. 1988. *Greek lyric*, II (London-Cambridge).
- Casaubon, I. 1621. *Animadversionum in Athenaei Dipnosophistas libri quindecim*. Secunda editio postrema, authoris cura diligenter recognita (Lugduni Batavorum).
- Comotti, G. 1991<sup>2</sup>. *La musica nella cultura greca e romana* (Torino).
- Del Grande, C. 1932. *Espressione musicale dei poeti greci* (Napoli).
- . 1960. *La metrica greca* (Torino).

22 On this dance see Ercoles 2012, 8f., with further bibl.

- Ercoles, M. 2012. *Musica greca sulle coste lidie: tra Sardi, Smirne ed Efeso*, in: D. Restani (ed.), *III Annual Meeting of MOISA*. Ravenna, 1-3 Ottobre 2009, Alma-DL (<http://ams-acta.cib.unibo.it/3201/>).
- Flach, H. 1883. *Geschichte der griechischen Lyrik* (Tübingen).
- Gentili, B. 1971. *I fr. 30 e 40 P. di Alcmene e la poetica della mimesi nella cultura greca arcaica*, in: AA.VV., *Studi in onore di V. De Falco* (Napoli), 57-67.
- Gentili, B.-Prato, C. 2002<sup>2</sup>. *Poetae elegiaci*, II (Berolini/Novi Eboraci).
- Gostoli, A. 1990. *Terpander* (Romae).
- Grandolini, S. 1993. *Canto processionale e culto nell'antica Grecia*, in: A.C. Cassio-G. Cerri (eds), *L'inno tra rituale letteratura nel mondo antico. Atti di un colloquio*. Napoli, 21-24 ottobre 1991 (Roma), 125-40.
- Labarbe, J. 1949. *L'Homère de Platon* (Paris).
- Lanata, G. 1963. *Poetica preplatonica* (Firenze).
- Lasserre, F. 1954. *Plutarque. De la musique* (Olten/Lausanne).
- Lavecchia, S. 2000. *Pindari dithyramborum fragmenta* (Romae Pisisque).
- Nobili, C. 2011. *Threnodic Elegy in Sparta*, GRBS 51, 26-48.
- Paterlini, M. 2001. *I nomoi di Clona*, RCCM 43, 105-8.
- Pinervi, A. 2010-2011. *Il prosodio e gli agoni musicali*, in: D. Castaldo-F.G. Giannachi-A. Manieri (eds) *Poesia, musica e agoni nella Grecia antica. Atti del IV convegno internazionale di MOISA*, Rudiae 22-23, 415-29.
- Porter, J.I. 2007. *Lasus of Hermione, Pindar and the Riddle of S*, CQ 57, 1-21.
- Thiersch, F. 1820. *Pindarus Werke*, II (Leipzig).
- Tunison, J.S. 1896. *The Sapphic stanza. A tentative study in Greek metrical, tonal and dancing art* (Granville).
- van der Weiden, M.J.H. 1991. *The dithyrambs of Pindar* (Amsterdam).
- Volkman, R. 1856. *Plutarchi De musica* (Lipsiae).
- Weil, H.-Reinach, T. 1900. *Plutarque. De la musique* (Paris).
- West, M.L. 1992. *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford).
- Westphal, R. 1865. *Plutarch, Über musik* (Breslau).
- Wilamowitz von Moellendorff, U. 1903. *Timotheos. Die Perser* (Leipzig).